

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

---

CARL MICHAEL SCOTT-PARKIN,

Petitioner,

Case No. 1:10-cv-513

v.

Honorable Janet T. Neff

MICHIGAN PAROLE BOARD et al.,

Respondents.

---

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

This is a habeas corpus action brought by a state prisoner pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Promptly after the filing of a petition for habeas corpus, the Court must undertake a preliminary review of the petition to determine whether “it plainly appears from the face of the petition and any exhibits annexed to it that the petitioner is not entitled to relief in the district court.” Rule 4, RULES GOVERNING § 2254 CASES; *see* 28 U.S.C. § 2243. If so, the petition must be summarily dismissed. Rule 4; *see Allen v. Perini*, 424 F.2d 134, 141 (6th Cir. 1970) (district court has the duty to “screen out” petitions that lack merit on their face). A dismissal under Rule 4 includes those petitions which raise legally frivolous claims, as well as those containing factual allegations that are palpably incredible or false. *Carson v. Burke*, 178 F.3d 434, 436-37 (6th Cir. 1999). The Court may *sua sponte* dismiss a habeas action as time-barred under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d). *Day v. McDonough*, 547 U.S. 198, 209 (2006). After undertaking the review required by Rule 4, I conclude that the petition is barred by the one-year statute of limitations.

## Discussion

### I. Factual Allegations

Petitioner Carl Michael Scott-Parkin presently is on parole. After Petitioner entered a plea of *nolo contendere* on November 7, 2006, he was convicted by the Kent County Circuit Court of second-degree criminal sexual conduct, MICH. COMP. LAWS § 750.520c(1)(a). On March 15, 2007, Petitioner was sentenced to a prison term of two to fifteen years. Petitioner sought leave to appeal his conviction to both the Michigan Court of Appeals and the Michigan Supreme Court, raising a single issue regarding the scoring of the sentencing guidelines and his ultimate sentence. The supreme court denied leave to appeal on November 29, 2007.

On December 22, 2009, Petitioner filed a motion for relief from judgment in the Kent County Circuit Court, again raising the issue that his sentence was invalid because the sentencing guidelines were misscored. The circuit court denied the motion on March 2, 2009. Petitioner sought leave to appeal to both the Michigan Court of Appeals and the Michigan Supreme Court. Both courts denied the motion because Petitioner failed to demonstrate entitlement to relief under MICH. CT. R. 6.508(D). The supreme court denied relief on December 21, 2009.

Petitioner filed the instant petition on or about May 27, 2010,<sup>1</sup> raising three grounds for relief:

- I. UNCONSTITUTIONALLY ACCEPTED PLEA OF GUILTY BY STATE CIRCUIT IN WHICH THE DEFENDANT NEVER ACTUALLY PLEAD[ED] NO CONTEST (GUILTY) TO ANY CRIME, THEREFORE, THE CIRCUIT COURT NEVER FULLY HAD JURISDICTION TO SENTENCE DEFENDANT TO A PRISON TERM.

---

<sup>1</sup>Under Sixth Circuit precedent, the application is deemed filed when handed to prison authorities for mailing to the federal court. *Cook v. Stegall*, 295 F.3d 517, 521 (6th Cir. 2002). Petitioner dated his application on May 27, 2010, and it was received by the Court on May 28, 2010. Thus, it must have been handed to prison officials for mailing at some time between May 27 and May 28, 2010. For purposes of this opinion, the Court has given Petitioner the benefit of the earliest possible filing date.

II. ACTUAL INNOCENCE TO THE CRIME(S) CHARGED.

III. INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL DURING PRE-TRIAL, TRIAL & ALSO ON APPEAL.

(Pet., docket #1 at 4-7.)

II. Statute of Limitations

Petitioner's application is barred by the one-year statute of limitations provided in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1), which became effective on April 24, 1996, as part of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act, PUB. L. NO. 104-132, 110 STAT. 1214 (AEDPA). Prior to enactment of the AEDPA, there was no defined period of limitation for habeas actions.<sup>2</sup> Section 2244(d)(1) provides:

(1) A 1-year period of limitation shall apply to an application for a writ of habeas corpus by a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court. The limitation period shall run from the latest of

(A) the date on which the judgment became final by the conclusion of direct review or the expiration of the time for seeking such review;

(B) the date on which the impediment to filing an application created by State action in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the applicant was prevented from filing by such State action;

(C) the date on which the constitutional right asserted was initially recognized by the Supreme Court, if the right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review; or

(D) the date on which the factual predicate of the claim or claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due diligence.

28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1). The running of the statute of limitations is tolled when “a properly filed application for State post-conviction or other collateral review with respect to the pertinent judgment

---

<sup>2</sup>Previously, the only time limit was provided in Rule 9 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, which allows dismissal of a petition only under circumstances where the state has been prejudiced by the delay in filing.

or claim is pending.” 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(2); *see also Duncan v. Walker*, 533 U.S. 167, 181-82 (2001) (limiting the tolling provision to only State, and not Federal, processes); *Artuz v. Bennett*, 531 U.S. 4, 8 (2000) (defining “properly filed”).

In most cases, § 2244(d)(1)(A) provides the operative date from which the one-year limitations period is measured. Under that provision, the one-year limitations period runs from “the date on which the judgment became final by the conclusion of direct review or the expiration of the time for seeking such review.” 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1)(A). According to paragraph nine of his habeas application, Petitioner appealed his conviction to the Michigan Court of Appeals and the Michigan Supreme Court. The Michigan Supreme Court denied his application on November 28, 2007. Petitioner did not petition for certiorari to the United States Supreme Court. The one-year limitations period, however, did not begin to run until the ninety-day period in which Petitioner could have sought review in the United States Supreme Court had expired. *See Lawrence v. Florida*, 549 U.S. 327, 332-33 (2007); *Bronaugh v. Ohio*, 235 F.3d 280, 283 (6th Cir. 2000). The ninety-day period expired on February 27, 2008. Petitioner had one year from that date, or until February 27, 2009, in which to file his habeas application. Petitioner filed on May 27, 2010. Obviously, he filed more than one year after the time for direct review expired. Thus, absent tolling, his application is time-barred.

As previously discussed, a properly filed application for state post-conviction review or other state collateral review tolls the statute of limitations during the period the application is pending. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(2). The statute of limitations is tolled from the filing of an application for state post-conviction or other collateral relief until a decision is issued by the state supreme court. *Lawrence v. Florida*, 549 U.S. 327 (2007). The statute is not tolled during the time

that a Petitioner petitions for writ of certiorari in the United States Supreme Court. *Id.* at 332. Petitioner filed his motion for relief from judgment on December 22, 2008, after 299 days of his period of limitations had expired. The statute of limitations was tolled from that date until December 21, 2009, when the Michigan Supreme Court issued its order denying leave to appeal. Thereafter, Petitioner had 66 days remaining in the limitations period in which to file his petition. The 66-day period expired on February 25, 2010. Petitioner did not file his habeas petition until May 27, 2010, three months after his limitations period expired.

The one-year limitations period applicable to § 2254 is a statute of limitations subject to equitable tolling. *See Akrawi v. Booker*, 572 F.3d 252, 260 (6th Cir. 2009); *Keenan v. Bagley*, 400 F.3d 417, 420 (6th Cir. 2005). A petitioner bears the burden of showing that he is entitled to equitable tolling. *See Keenan*, 400 F.3d at 420; *Allen v. Yukins*, 366 F.3d 396, 401 (6th Cir. 2004). The Sixth Circuit repeatedly has cautioned that equitable tolling should be applied “sparingly” by this Court. *See Sherwood v. Prelesnik*, 579 F.3d 581, 588 (6th Cir. 2009); *Jurado v. Burt*, 337 F.3d 638, 642 (6th Cir. 2003); *Cook v. Stegall*, 295 F.3d 517, 521 (6th Cir. 2002). A petitioner seeking equitable tolling of the habeas statute of limitations has the burden of establishing two elements: “(1) that he has been pursuing his rights diligently, and (2) that some extraordinary circumstance stood in his way.” *Lawrence*, 549 U.S. at 335 (citing *Pace v. DiGuglielmo*, 544 U.S. 408, 418 (2005)); *Akrawi*, 572 F.3d at 260.

Petitioner has failed to raise equitable tolling or to allege any facts or circumstances that would warrant its application in this case. However, Petitioner generally claims that he is actually innocent of the offense for which he was convicted. The Sixth Circuit has held that a habeas petitioner who demonstrates a credible claim of actual innocence based on new evidence

may, in exceptional circumstances, be entitled to equitable tolling of habeas limitations. *See McCray v. Vasbinder*, 499 F.3d 568, 577 (6th Cir. 2007); *Souter v. Jones*, 395 F.3d 577, 597-98 (6th Cir. 2005). Petitioner, however, fails to meet the standard for proving a claim of actual innocence. To support a claim of actual innocence, a petitioner must demonstrate that, in light of all the evidence, it is more likely than not that no reasonable juror would have convicted him. *Shlup v. Delo*, 513 U.S. 298, 327 (1995); *Souter*, 395 F.3d at 590, 598-99; *Allen*, 366 F.3d at 405. A valid claim of actual innocence requires a petitioner “to support his allegations of constitutional error with new reliable evidence--whether it be exculpatory scientific evidence, trustworthy eyewitness account, or critical physical evidence--that was not presented at trial.” *Schlup v. Delo*, 513 U.S. 298, 324 (1995). Furthermore, actual innocence means “factual innocence, not mere legal insufficiency.” *Souter*, 395 F.3d at 590 (quoting *Bousley v. United States*, 523 U.S. 614, 623 (1998)). A petitioner “must produce evidence of innocence so strong that the court can not have confidence in the outcome of the trial unless the court is also satisfied that the trial was free of nonharmless constitutional error.” *Allen*, 366 F.3d at 405 (internal quotations and citations omitted).

Petitioner has made no such showing in this case. Although Petitioner attaches the affidavits of individuals who offer their opinions that he is not guilty of the offense to which he pleaded, such evidence is wholly insufficient to undermine confidence in his plea and conviction. *Id.* Accordingly, Petitioner is not entitled to equitable tolling of the statute of limitations.

The Supreme Court has directed the District Court to give fair notice and an adequate opportunity to be heard before dismissal of a petition on statute of limitations grounds. *See Day*, 547 U.S. at 210. This report and recommendation shall therefore serve as notice that the District Court may dismiss Petitioner’s application for habeas corpus relief as time-barred. The opportunity

to file objections to this report and recommendation constitutes Petitioner's opportunity to be heard by the District Judge.

**Recommended Disposition**

For the foregoing reasons, I recommend that the habeas corpus petition be denied because it is barred by the one-year statute of limitations. I further recommend that a certificate of appealability be denied. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473 (2000).

Date: June 22, 2010

/s/ Ellen S. Carmody  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ELLEN S. CARMODY  
United States Magistrate Judge

**NOTICE TO PARTIES**

Any objections to this Report and Recommendation must be filed and served within 14 days of service of this notice on you. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b). All objections and responses to objections are governed by W.D. Mich. LCivR 72.3(b). Failure to file timely objections may constitute a waiver of any further right of appeal. *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981); *see Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985).